arXiv:1404.5153v3 [quant-ph] 23 Mar 2016

Optimal bounds for parity-oblivious random access codes

André Chailloux* Iordanis Kerenidis† Srijita Kundu‡ Jamie Sikora§

March 23, 2016

Abstract

Random access coding is an information task that has been extensively studied and found many applications in quantum information. In this scenario, Alice receives an n-bit string x, and wishes to encode x into a quantum state ρ_x, such that Bob, when receiving the state ρ_x, can choose any bit $i \in [n]$ and recover the input bit x_i with high probability. Here we study two variants: parity-oblivious random access codes, where we impose the cryptographic property that Bob cannot infer any information about the parity of any subset of bits of the input apart from the single bits x_i; and even-parity-oblivious random access codes, where Bob cannot infer any information about the parity of any even-size subset of bits of the input.

In this paper, we provide the optimal bounds for parity-oblivious quantum random access codes and show that they are asymptotically better than the optimal classical ones. Our results provide a large non-contextuality inequality violation and resolve the main open problem in a work of Spekkens, Buzacott, Keehn, Toner, and Pryde (2009). Second, we provide the optimal bounds for even-parity-oblivious random access codes by proving their equivalence to a non-local game and by providing tight bounds for the success probability of the non-local game via semidefinite programming. In the case of even-parity-oblivious random access codes, the cryptographic property holds also in the device-independent model.

*INRIA, Paris Rocquencourt, SECRET Project Team. Email: andre.chailloux@inria.fr.

†IRIF, Université Paris Diderot, Paris, France and Centre for Quantum Technologies, National University of Singapore, Singapore. Email: jkeren@liafa.univ-paris-diderot.fr.

‡Chennai Mathematical Institute, Chennai, India. Email: srijita@cmi.ac.in.

§Centre for Quantum Technologies, National University of Singapore, and MajuLab, CNRS-UNS-NUS-NTU International Joint Research Unit, UMI 3654, Singapore. Email: cqtjwjs@nus.edu.sg.

1 Introduction

Quantum information theory studies how information is encoded in quantum mechanical systems and how it can be transmitted through quantum channels. A main question is whether quantum information is more powerful than classical information. A celebrated result by Holevo [Hol73] shows that quantum information cannot be used to compress classical information. In high level, in order to transmit n uniformly random classical bits, one needs to transmit no less than n quantum bits. This might imply that quantum information is no more powerful than classical information. This however is wrong in many situations. In the model of communication complexity, one can show that transmitting quantum information may result in exponential savings on the communication needed to solve specific problems ([Raz99, BCWdW01, BJK04, GKK$^+$08, RK11]).

One specific information task that has been extensively studied in quantum information is the notion of *random access codes* (RACs) [Nay99, ANTV99, ANTV02]. In this scenario, Alice receives an n-bit string x, drawn from the uniform distribution, and wishes to encode x into a quantum state ρ_x, such that Bob, when receiving the state ρ_x, can choose any bit $i \in [n]$ and recover the input bit x_i with high probability by performing some general quantum operation on ρ_x.

RACs have been used in various situations in quantum information and computation, including in communication complexity, non-locality, extractors and device-independent cryptography [BARdW08, INRY07, PZ10, DV10, LPY$^+$12]. Even though this task seems easier than transmitting the entire input string x, it is known that the length of quantum RACs must be at least $\Omega(n)$ [Nay99]. In fact, the length of a classical RAC can be within a logarithmic additive factor of a quantum RAC [ANTV99].

On the other hand, a well-known example shows the advantages of quantum RACs by using a single qubit to encode two uniformly random classical bits. In this case, the success of correctly decoding either bit is $\cos^2(\pi/8)$ [BBBW83, ANTV99] while the optimal classical encoding can achieve an average success probability of $3/4$. An advantage can also be proven for the case of encoding three classical bits into one qubit as shown by Chuang (see [ANTV02] for details), but not for $n \geq 4$ [HIN$^+$06].

Nevertheless, a question remained of whether there are variants of RACs, for which we can have an asymptotically significant advantage in the quantum case. We show that this is indeed the case for the so-called *parity-oblivious* RACs (denoted here as PO-RACs). These are the usual RACs with the extra cryptographic property that the receiver cannot infer any information about the parity of any subset of bits of the input, apart from the single bits.

This cryptographic property means, in particular, that once some information about a bit is learned, then no other information can be extracted about any of the other bits. Such a notion has applications in various areas of cryptography. For example, this is a requirement for a class of classical or quantum protocols known as *symmetric-private information retrieval schemes* (PIR) [GIKM98, KdW04] where one or more servers have a database x, a user chooses an index i and at the end, the user learns x_i but no other bit of x, and i remains hidden. A parity-oblivious RAC satisfies the security conditions of a PIR scheme since the index i remains hidden (the RAC is non-interactive) and the user cannot learn more than one bit of the database.

Random access codes that are parity-oblivious have been considered before. For example, the previously mentioned RACs for encoding two or three classical bits in one qubit have this property. It is not hard to check that for any subset of the inputs of size 2 or greater, Bob's reduced density matrix is exactly the same for the cases where the parity is 0 or 1. In other words, Bob has no information about the parity. These RACs violate a *non-contextuality inequality* developed by Spekkens, Buzacott, Keehn, Toner, and Pryde [SBK$^+$09]. This inequality is discussed further in Subsection 1.1.3.

We will also define a weaker variant called *even-parity-oblivious* RACs (denoted as EPO-RACs), where

the receiver can infer no information about the parity of any even-size subset of the input. These codes are interesting for two reasons: first, they will let us prove tight upper bounds for PO-RACs; and second, due to their equivalence with a non-local game, their cryptographic property holds in the device independent setting.

1.1 Our results

We split our results into four sections. We first present the optimal bounds for parity-oblivious quantum RACs and even-parity-oblivious RACs. We then contrast this to the classical case (Subsection 1.1.2), discuss a violation of a *non-contextuality inequality* (Subsection 1.1.3), then discuss the security of our optimal quantum RACs in the device-independent model (Subsection 1.1.4).

1.1.1 Quantum random access codes and cryptographic security definitions

Formally, a quantum RAC of n classical bits is simply a set of quantum states $\{\rho_x : x \in \{0,1\}^n\}$. We suppose Alice chooses $x \in \{0,1\}^n$ uniformly at random, prepares the state ρ_x, and sends ρ_x to Bob who has a POVM $\{M_0^t, M_1^t\}$ where the subscript b of M_b^t serves as his guess for the t-th bit of x, denoted x_t, for each index $t \in [n] := \{1, \ldots, n\}$. Suppose that x_t can be decoded with success probability $\frac{1}{2}(1+\alpha_t)$. Then we say that the *bias*, or *worst-case bias*, of the RAC is

$$\min_{t\in[n]} \alpha_t$$

and the *average-case bias* is

$$\mathop{\mathbb{E}}_{t\sim\mu([n])} \alpha_t,$$

where μ is the uniform probability distribution.

We consider two cryptographic variants of quantum RACs in this paper. We are concerned with designing quantum RACs which *hide* some information about the encoded string x from a potentially cheating Bob. By information being hidden, we mean that there exists no measurement which yields a correct guess with probability greater than that of randomly guessing. In particular, we consider the case where Bob cannot learn the value of

$$x_S := \bigoplus_{i\in S} x_i,$$

for certain choices of subset $S \subseteq [n]$, of Alice's encoded string x. We call the value x_S the *S-parity of the string x*.

Definition 1 (Parity-oblivious and even-parity-oblivious quantum RACs)**.** *We say that a quantum* RAC $\{\rho_x : x \in \{0,1\}^n\}$ *is* parity-oblivious, *denoted* PO-RAC^n*, if the receiver can infer no information about x_S for any subset $S \subseteq [n]$ of size 2 or greater, when x is chosen uniformly at random. In other words, for all $S \subseteq [n]$ of size 2 or greater, we have*

$$\frac{1}{2^{n-1}} \sum_{x\,:\,x_S=0} \rho_x = \frac{1}{2^{n-1}} \sum_{x\,:\,x_S=1} \rho_x.$$

We say that a quantum RAC *is* even-parity-oblivious, *denoted* EPO-RAC^n*, if the receiver can infer no information about x_S for any subset $S \subseteq [n]$ of* even *size, 2 or greater.*

Note that the usual treatment of RACs is to analyze the relationships between the number of encoded bits n, the bias α, and the encoding dimension of ρ_x. Here, we are not concerned with the encoding dimension, but rather the ability to achieve cryptographic security in terms of parity-obliviousness.

In this paper, we present the optimal bias for a quantum PO-RAC^n and show that they perform asymptotically better than the optimal classical version.

Theorem 1 (Optimal quantum parity-oblivious random access codes)**.** *For any integer $n \geq 2$, a quantum parity-oblivious random access code of n bits has worst-case bias at most $1/\sqrt{n}$. Moreover, this bound can be achieved using $\lfloor n/2 \rfloor$ qubits.*

This is in contrast to the classical setting where the optimal *average-case* bias is provably $1/n$ [SBK$^+$09] (discussed further in Subsection 1.1.2).

The main idea of the proof of the upper bound is that quantum encodings can be studied through their close relationship to non-local games. Such connections were noted in [OW10] and in [CKS14] it was shown that certain non-local games are equivalent to quantum encodings in the sense that the optimal average decoding probability is equal to the success probability of the non-local game.

In a non-local game, two non-communicating parties, Alice and Bob, receive some inputs s and t, respectively, according to some probability distribution known to Alice and Bob, and must output a and b, respectively, such that (s, t, a, b) satisfy some specific condition. For example, in the CHSH game, the condition is $a \oplus b = s \cdot t$. The goal is to find the optimal quantum (resp. classical) success probability of satisfying the condition when Alice and Bob are allowed to share some initial quantum state (resp. shared randomness).

We now define a very natural non-local game called the INDEX game which we use in the analysis in this paper.

Definition 2 (INDEX game)**.** *The* INDEX^n game*, parameterized by n, is the following non-local game:*

- *Alice's input: Alice receives a random s from the set $S := \{0,1\}^n$.*
- *Bob's input: Bob receives a random index t from the set $T := [n]$.*
- *Winning condition: They win if Alice's output bit a and Bob's output bit b satisfy $a \oplus b = s_t$.*

The choice of initial resource state and local measurement operators (that depend on the respective inputs) comprise a *strategy*. We say that a strategy for the INDEX^n game has *bias* α if

$$\mathop{\mathbb{E}}_{s\sim\mu(\{0,1\}^n)} \mathop{\mathbb{E}}_{t\sim\mu([n])} \Pr[\text{Alice's output } a \text{ and Bob's output } b \text{ satisfy } a \oplus b = s_t] = \frac{1}{2}(1+\alpha).$$

We show that even-parity-oblivious RACs with *average-case* bias are equivalent to the INDEX game. In other words, any INDEX game strategy with bias α yields an even-parity-oblivious RAC with *average-case* bias α and vice versa.

Theorem 2 (Equivalence)**.** *For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists a quantum even-parity-oblivious* RAC *of n bits with* average-case *bias α if and only if there exists a quantum* INDEX^n *strategy with bias α.*

Noting that the INDEX game is an XOR game, i.e., the winning condition depends only on the XOR of Alice and Bob's one-bit answers, we use a tight semidefinite programming characterization [CSUU08] to provide the exact optimal quantum bias.

Theorem 3 (Optimal quantum INDEX game bias)**.** *For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the optimal quantum bias of an* INDEX^n *strategy is $1/\sqrt{n}$.*

The above two theorems imply the optimal bounds for even-parity-oblivious random access codes.

Corollary 1 (Optimal quantum even-parity-oblivious random access codes)**.** *For any integer $n \geq 2$, a quantum even-parity-oblivious random access code of n bits has average-case bias at most $1/\sqrt{n}$. Moreover, this bound can be achieved using $\lfloor n/2 \rfloor$ qubits.*

Since the *worst-case* bias of a quantum PO-RAC is obviously upper bounded by the optimal *average-case* bias of a quantum RAC hiding *only* the even parities, Theorems 2 and 1 show that every PO-RAC^n has bias at most $1/\sqrt{n}$.

To prove this upper bound is tight, we give an explicit construction of a quantum PO-RAC of n bits with bias $1/\sqrt{n}$ that uses $\lfloor n/2 \rfloor$ qubits and 1 classical bit. This RAC is based on the notion of *hyperbits* [PW12] and a proof of Tsirelson's Theorem [Tsi87]. We then discuss how to remove the classical bit and make it *device-independent* (see Subsection 1.1.4 for more details about the device-independent model).

We remark that parity-oblivious and even-parity-oblivious quantum RACs both share the same worst-case and average-case bias of $1/\sqrt{n}$. However, the same is not true if we consider *odd-parity-oblivious* RACs where the parities are hidden for only odd-size subsets (greater or equal to 3). Consider encoding a six-bit string $(x_1, \ldots, x_6)$ where the first three bits are encoded using Chuang's PO-RAC and similarly for the last three bits. It is a straightforward exercise to verify that this is odd-parity-oblivious and that any bit can be decoded with bias $1/\sqrt{3} > 1/\sqrt{6}$. We leave finding the optimal bounds for odd-parity-oblivious RACs an open problem.

1.1.2 Parity-oblivious classical RACs

We also study classical RACs, defined below, for which both variants of bias and both variants of parity-obliviousness are defined analogously.

Definition 3 (Classical RACs with worst-case and average-case biases)**.** *A* classical RAC *is a set of strings $\{e(x, r) : x \in \{0,1\}^n, r \in \{0,1\}^m\}$ where r corresponds to private randomness. After choosing $x \in \{0,1\}^n$ uniformly at random, Alice samples r from the private randomness, sends to Bob the string $e(x, r)$, and Bob has a decoding procedure given as function f_t, for each $t \in [n]$, for learning the t'th bit of x.*

We note that the equivalence stated in Theorem 2 holds in the classical case as well (remarked in Section 2). To find the optimal average-case bias of even-parity-oblivious classical RACs, we provide the following theorem.

Theorem 4 (Optimal classical INDEX game bias)**.** *For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the optimal classical bias of an* INDEX^n *strategy is $\sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi n}}(1 + O(1/n))$.*

This theorem, together with the classical version of the equivalence shows that classical RACs that are even-parity-oblivious have an optimal average-case bias of $\sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi n}}(1 + O(1/n))$. Note that, asymptotically, this value is the same as the quantum value, that is, having a bias of $O(1/\sqrt{n})$. However, differences arise when one considers RACs that also hide the odd parities. Consider the following proposition of Spekkens, Buzacott, Keehn, Toner, and Pryde.

Proposition 1 (Optimal parity-oblivious classical RACs [SBK$^+$09])**.** *For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, a parity-oblivious classical* RAC *of n bits has* average-case bias *at most $1/n$. Moreover, this bound can be achieved using 1 classical bit.*

Thus, there is a difference between the optimal average-case biases of parity-oblivious and even-parity-oblivious RACs in the classical setting, in contrast to the quantum setting.

1.1.3 Large non-contextuality inequality violations

The basic primitives in an operational theory are preparations and measurements which can be thought of as instructions for the laboratory apparatus. For example, the operational theory can be given in terms of *hidden variables* which are probability distributions characterizing the outcomes of the preparations and measurements. That is, a preparation creates a *physical state* (each occurring with some probability) and a measurement acts upon a physical state and outputs a *prediction* or simply an *outcome* (each occurring with some probability). Thus, the probability distributions characterizing these actions are how they are represented in this model.

A hidden variable model is *preparation non-contextual* if whenever two preparations yield the same statistics for all possible measurements then they are represented equivalently in the model and a hidden variable model is *measurement non-contextual* if whenever two measurements have the same statistics for all preparations then they are represented equivalently in the model (see [SBK$^+$09] and references therein for a more thorough discussion). Similar to non-locality, a non-contextuality inequality is any inequality on probability distributions that follows from the assumption that there exists a hidden variable model that is preparation or measurement non-contextual.

Spekkens, Buzacott, Keehn, Toner, and Pryde [SBK$^+$09] proved the following *non-contextuality inequality* (or NC inequality, for short).

Proposition 2 (Non-contextuality inequality [SBK$^+$09])**.** *In any operational theory that admits a preparation non-contextual hidden variable model, the* average-case bias *for any parity-oblivious* RAC *is at most $1/n$.*

Then, they discussed that quantum mechanics violates this NC inequality for $n \in \{2, 3\}$, by noting the previously mentioned parity-oblivious quantum RACs of two and three classical bits into one qubit with respective average-case biases of $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$ and $\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}$. It was left as an open question whether quantum mechanics violates this NC inequality for $n \geq 4$.

Through our analysis, we have shown that the optimal average-case bias for quantum parity-oblivious RACs is $1/\sqrt{n}$, thus resolving their main open question. This provides a family of NC inequality violations that grow with the input size n.

Note, that if there exists a game for which the winning probability of any classical strategy cannot deviate from $1/2$ by more than δ_1 and, moreover, there is a quantum strategy with winning probability at least $1/2+\delta_2$, then we can obtain a violation of order δ_2/δ_1 (see [BRSdW12] for details). Hence, to quantify the violation of this NC inequality, we consider the ratio of the optimal average-case bias of quantum parity-oblivious RACs and that of any operational theory admitting a preparation non-contextual hidden variable model. More precisely, we show an explicit non-contextuality inequality violation of order $\sqrt{n}$.

Theorem 5. *For any integer $n \geq 2$, there exists an explicit non-contextuality inequality that provides a violation of order $\sqrt{n}$.*

Note that other large non-contextuality inequality violations have been found, see for example the work of Vidick and Wehner [VW11].

1.1.4 Device-independent quantum RACs

Until this point, we have discussed the bias and the parity-obliviousness of a quantum RAC which are functions of the encoding states $\{\rho_x : x \in \{0,1\}^n\}$ only. However, much of the cryptographic analysis in this paper is concerned with how the states ρ_x are *prepared*. In this subsection, we discuss how the security of the RAC is affected if one cannot trust the quantum apparatus used in the preparation of ρ_x.

The device-independent model of cryptographic security deals with the setting when the devices used in the protocol are not trusted, or are even malicious, being created by the cheaters/eavesdroppers themselves. Many security proofs in this setting are based on quantum non-locality or the no-signalling principle, each having their own limitations which ultimately limits the cheating capabilities for anyone controlling the preparation and/or execution of the quantum devices in the protocol. Recall that the no-signalling principle, which is satisfied by the laws of quantum mechanics, roughly states that it is impossible to *send information* arbitrarily fast, in particular faster than the speed of light. For example, in a quantum setting, Alice cannot convey information to a distant Bob by simply measuring her half of a shared quantum state.

Obviously, if the preparation of the encoding ρ_x is as simple as Alice having a quantum device which outputs ρ_x on input x, then certainly device-independence is not feasible since Bob may control the quantum device and just have it prepare $\rho_x = |x\rangle\langle x|$ (or some other function of x according to what he wishes to learn). However, the preparation need not be so simple. We now sketch the preparation of the quantum RACs presented in this work to give an idea of how they can be device-independent.

First, Alice creates a bipartite quantum state $|\psi\rangle$ and sends a subsystem to Bob. *Afterwards* she chooses a string $s \in \{0,1\}^n$ uniformly at random and measures her half of the state to get an outcome $a \in \{0,1\}$. She then defines $x_t := s_t \oplus a$, for all $t \in [n]$, and Bob's post-measured state is now his encoding of the string x. Since there is no communication from Alice to Bob after Alice chooses s, he must not be able to infer any information about s from his encoding of x. Thus, Bob has limited information of any function of x which contains information about s. For example, Bob cannot learn $x_1 \oplus x_2$ since

$$x_1 \oplus x_2 = (s_1 \oplus a) \oplus (s_2 \oplus a) = s_1 \oplus s_2$$

which is hidden by the no-signalling principle. Therefore, even if Bob created the entire state which Alice shares at the beginning, and Alice's measurement, he cannot infer any information about $x_1 \oplus x_2$, promised only by the no-signalling principle.

Theorem 6. *There exists a preparation of an optimal* PO-RAC^n *with bias* $1/\sqrt{n}$ *which is even-parity-oblivious in the device-independent model against a no-signalling Bob.*

We prove the above theorem using a small modification of our optimal PO-RAC^n in Section 4. See Subsection 4.3 for more details. Note also that the above theorem implies that there exist optimal even-parity-oblivious random access codes which retain their cryptographic property in the device independent model.

1.2 Organization of the paper

In Section 2, we prove the equivalence of even-parity-oblivious RACs and INDEX^n strategies. In Section 3 we discuss the optimal quantum and classical bias of the INDEX^n game for any n. We conclude in Section 4 by presenting an optimal parity-oblivious quantum RAC and prove the security for the even-parity-obliviousness in the device-independent model.

2 Equivalence of EPO-RACs and INDEX^n strategies

In this section we prove the equivalence in Theorem 2, reproduced below.

Theorem 2 (Equivalence)**.** *For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists a quantum even-parity-oblivious* RAC *of n uniformly random classical bits with* average-case *bias α if and only if there exists a quantum* INDEX^n *strategy with bias α.*

For this reason, even-parity-obliviousness of a RAC is a very natural property. In particular, in the simple reduction from INDEX strategies to RACs (Subsection 2.2), we see how even-parity-obliviousness appears and how the RAC may not hide the odd parities.

2.1 From RACs to INDEX strategies

Let us fix an even-parity-oblivious RAC $\{\rho_x : x \in \{0,1\}^n\}$ with average-case bias α. Let $\mathcal{B}$ be the Hilbert space used for the encoding. Our goal is to construct a strategy for INDEX^n with bias α. For each ρ_x, we fix a purification $|\psi_x\rangle$ of ρ_x in the space $\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{B}$. For $a \in \{0,1\}$, let $\boldsymbol{a}$ be the n-bit string $(a, \ldots, a)$ and $\bar{s}$ be the bit-wise complement of a string s. For $s \in \{0,1\}^n$, define the following state

$$|\Omega_s\rangle := \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \sum_{a \in \{0,1\}} |a\rangle_{\mathcal{O}} |\psi_{s \oplus \boldsymbol{a}}\rangle_{\mathcal{AB}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}|0\rangle|\psi_s\rangle + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}|1\rangle|\psi_{\bar{s}}\rangle,$$

where $\mathcal{O}$ is a qubit register containing the value of a. We would like to show that if Bob has the register $\mathcal{B}$ of the above state, then he has no information about s. Note that his reduced state is $\sigma_s := \frac{1}{2}\rho_s + \frac{1}{2}\rho_{\bar{s}}$.

The first step is to see that Bob has no information about any parity of s (not even of the values of the singleton bits). Fix an arbitrary, non-empty subset S. For fixed $b \in \{0,1\}$, Bob's reduced state, averaged over all $s \in \{0,1\}^n$ such that $s_S = b$, is given by

$$\sigma_S^b := \frac{1}{2^{n-1}} \sum_{s : s_S = b} \sigma_s = \frac{1}{2^n} \left(\sum_{s : s_S = b} \rho_s + \sum_{s : s_S = b} \rho_{\bar{s}} \right).$$

Note that $s_S = \bar{s}_S$ when $|S|$ is even and $s_S = \bar{s}_S \oplus 1$ when $|S|$ is odd. Thus, by defining ρ_S^b in the similar way

$$\rho_S^b := \frac{1}{2^{n-1}} \sum_{s : s_S = b} \rho_s$$

we can easily verify that $\sigma_S^b = \rho_S^b$ when $|S|$ is even and $\sigma_S^b = \frac{1}{2}\rho_S^0 + \frac{1}{2}\rho_S^1$ when $|S|$ is odd. Note that since $\{\rho_x : x \in \{0,1\}^n\}$ is an even-parity-oblivious RAC, we have by definition that $\rho_S^0 = \rho_S^1$ for $|S|$ even (otherwise, Bob could measure to learn some information about the even parity). Thus, we have that $\sigma_S^0 = \sigma_S^1$ for all nonempty subsets S and therefore all the parities are hidden from Bob when given σ_s (when s is chosen uniformly at random). This means that for any nonempty subset S and measurement M, Bob has a maximum probability of $1/2$ of successfully guessing s_S from the RAC $\{\sigma_s : s \in \{0,1\}^n\}$.

In the following lemma, we prove that if an encoding reveals no information about the parity of any subset, then the encoding reveals no information about the string. This is intuitively an obvious statement that we rigorously prove below.

Lemma 1. *If an encoding $\{\sigma_s : s \in \{0,1\}^n\}$ satisfies $\mathbb{E}_{s \sim \mu(\{0,1\}^n)} \Pr[\text{learn } s_S] = \frac{1}{2}$, for every subset $S \subseteq [n] \setminus \emptyset$, then $\sigma_s = \sigma_{s'}$ for all $s, s' \in \{0,1\}^n$.*

Proof. Suppose for a contradiction that there exists $s, s' \in \{0,1\}^n$ such that $\sigma_s \neq \sigma_{s'}$. Then there exists a subset $T \subseteq \{0,1\}^n$ of size 2^{n-1} such that $\sigma_T = \frac{1}{2^{n-1}} \sum_{s \in T} \sigma_s$ is not equal to $\sigma_{\bar{T}} = \frac{1}{2^{n-1}} \sum_{s \in \bar{T}} \sigma_s$, where $\bar{T}$ denotes the complement of the set T. To see this, take any subset $T \subseteq \{0,1\}^n$ of size 2^{n-1}; if $\sigma_T = \sigma_{\bar{T}}$, then we can find $s \in T$ and $s' \in \bar{T}$ such that $\sigma_s \neq \sigma_{s'}$, since all the σ_i are not equal. We consider the subset T' where we add $\{s'\}$ and remove $\{s\}$ from T to obtain $\sigma_{T'} \neq \sigma_{\bar{T}'}$.

This means that there exists a two-outcome measurement $\{M_T, M_{\bar{T}}\}$ that outputs 1 if $s \in T$ and -1 otherwise, with positive bias. We now show for a contradiction that this measurement must also output a parity of some nonempty subset with positive bias. Define the function $f : \{0,1\}^n \to \{-1,+1\}$ as the indicator function of T and let b be the expectation over the measurement outcomes when measuring σ_s with $\{M_T, M_{\bar{T}}\}$, so $b(s) := \mathrm{Tr}(\sigma_s M_T) - \mathrm{Tr}(\sigma_s M_{\bar{T}})$. Then

$$\mathop{\mathbb{E}}_{s \sim \mu(\{0,1\}^n)} [b(s) \cdot f(s)] > 0.$$

By taking the Fourier representation of the function, we have

$$\mathop{\mathbb{E}}_{s \sim \mu(\{0,1\}^n)} [b(s) \cdot f(s)] = \mathop{\mathbb{E}}_{s \sim \mu(\{0,1\}^n)} \left[b(s) \cdot \sum_{S \subseteq [n]} \hat{f}(S) \, (-1)^{s_S} \right] = \sum_{S \subseteq [n]} \hat{f}(S) \mathop{\mathbb{E}}_{s \sim \mu(\{0,1\}^n)} [b(s) \cdot (-1)^{s_S}] > 0.$$

Note that $\hat{f}(\emptyset) = \mathbb{E}[f(s)] = 0$, because $|T| = |\bar{T}|$, implying that there exists a non-empty subset S for which

$$\mathop{\mathbb{E}}_{s \sim \mu(\{0,1\}^n)} [b(s) \cdot (-1)^{s_S}] \neq 0,$$

which is a contradiction. □

The above statement means that for each s, we have $\mathrm{Tr}_{\mathcal{OA}} |\Omega_s\rangle\langle\Omega_s| = \mathrm{Tr}_{\mathcal{OA}} |\Omega_0\rangle\langle\Omega_0|$. In particular, for any $s \in \{0,1\}^n$ there exists a unitary U_s acting on $\mathcal{OA}$ such that $(U_s \otimes I)|\Omega_0\rangle = |\Omega_s\rangle$. We use the state $|\Omega_0\rangle$ to define the INDEX^n strategy:

- Alice and Bob share the state $|\Omega_0\rangle \in \mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{B}$.
- Upon receiving $s \in \{0,1\}^n$, Alice applies U_s on $\mathcal{OA}$ such that Alice and Bob share $|\Omega_s\rangle$. Alice measures register $\mathcal{O}$ in the computational basis and outputs the measurement outcome a.
- For Alice's input s and output a, Bob has an encoding ρ_x where $x := s \oplus \boldsymbol{a}$ occurs uniformly at random. Upon receiving $t \in [n]$, Bob measures $\mathcal{B}$ just as in the RAC to learn x_t. He outputs b equal to his guess.
- Alice and Bob win the game if $b = s_t \oplus a = x_t$ meaning that they win the game if and only if Bob correctly guesses x_t.

Since the RAC has average-case bias α, we see that with this INDEX^n strategy, they succeed with probability

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathop{\mathbb{E}}_{s \sim \mu(\{0,1\}^n)} \mathop{\mathbb{E}}_{t \sim \mu([n])} \Pr[\text{Alice's output } a \text{ and Bob's output } b \text{ satisfy } a \oplus b = s_t] \\ = & \mathop{\mathbb{E}}_{x \sim \mu(\{0,1\}^n)} \mathop{\mathbb{E}}_{t \sim \mu([n])} \Pr[\text{Bob correctly outputs } x_t \text{ from the } \{\rho_x : x \in \{0,1\}^n\} \text{ RAC}] \\ = & \frac{1}{2}(1+\alpha), \end{aligned}$$

as desired.

2.2 From INDEX strategies to RAC

Suppose Alice and Bob have a strategy to win the INDEX^n game with bias α with starting state $|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{B}$. On input $s \in \{0,1\}^n$, Alice performs on her side the corresponding measurement which generates her outcome a. We assume that a is uniformly random and independent of s (which can be guaranteed by taking the XOR with an independently and uniformly random bit that is shared with Bob). Let $\rho_{s,a}$ be the state that Bob has when Alice has input s and outputs a and define the RAC $\{\sigma_x : x \in \{0,1\}^n\}$ where $\sigma_x := \frac{1}{2}\rho_{x,0} + \frac{1}{2}\rho_{\bar{x},1}$ for each $x \in \{0,1\}^n$. We now show that $\{\sigma_x : x \in \{0,1\}^n\}$ is an even-parity-oblivious RAC with average-case bias α. Note that $\frac{1}{2}\rho_{s,0} + \frac{1}{2}\rho_{s,1}$ is independent of s by the no-signalling principle. For convenience, define $\rho := \frac{1}{2}\rho_{s,0} + \frac{1}{2}\rho_{s,1}$ for any $s \in \{0,1\}^n$.

1. It hides the even parities: Let $S \subseteq \{0,1\}^n$ be a subset of even size and $b \in \{0,1\}$ be an arbitrary bit. Then we have $x_S = \bar{x}_S$ for any $x \in \{0,1\}^n$, since $|S|$ is even. Bob's reduced state, averaged over all $x \in \{0,1\}^n$ such that $x_S = b$, is given by

$$\frac{1}{2^{n-1}} \sum_{x:x_S=b} \sigma_x = \frac{1}{2^n} \sum_{x:x_S=b} \rho_{x,0} + \frac{1}{2^n} \sum_{x:x_S=b} \rho_{\bar{x},1} = \frac{1}{2^n} \sum_{x:x_S=b} \rho_{x,0} + \frac{1}{2^n} \sum_{x:x_S=b} \rho_{x,1} = \rho,$$

   which is independent of b, thus proving the RAC is even-parity-oblivious.

2. Since Alice and Bob win the INDEX^n game with average-case bias α, we know that

$$\frac{1}{2}(1+\alpha) = \mathop{\mathbb{E}}_{a\sim\mu(\{0,1\})} \mathop{\mathbb{E}}_{s\sim\mu(\{0,1\}^n)} \mathop{\mathbb{E}}_{t\sim\mu([n])} \Pr[\text{Bob learns } s_t \oplus a \text{ from } \rho_{s,a}].$$

   By defining $x := s \oplus \boldsymbol{a}$, we can write the above as

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2}(1+\alpha) &= \mathop{\mathbb{E}}_{a\sim\mu(\{0,1\})} \mathop{\mathbb{E}}_{x\sim\mu(\{0,1\}^n)} \mathop{\mathbb{E}}_{t\sim\mu([n])} \Pr[\text{Bob learns } x_t \text{ from } \rho_{x\oplus\boldsymbol{a},a}] \\ &= \mathop{\mathbb{E}}_{x\sim\mu(\{0,1\}^n)} \mathop{\mathbb{E}}_{t\sim\mu([n])} \Pr[\text{Bob learns } x_t \text{ from } \sigma_x] \end{aligned}$$

   as desired.

Note that in the proof above, we are treating x, the string Alice wishes to encode, as $s \oplus \boldsymbol{a}$. We now remark that some of the odd parities of x may not be hidden from Bob. For example, if in the INDEX game Alice simply outputs $a = s_1 \oplus s_2 \oplus s_3 \oplus d$, where d is the uniformly random bit Alice and Bob share to make a independent of s, then we have $x_1 \oplus x_2 \oplus x_3 = d$ and Bob would know this odd parity exactly. However, the even parities of x are equal to those of s which are hidden by the no-signalling principle.

Remark 1. *The above equivalence also holds in the classical setting.*

3 On the structure of optimal INDEX game strategies

In this section, we prove Theorems 3 and 4, that the optimal quantum bias of an INDEX^n strategy is $1/\sqrt{n}$ and the optimal classical bias of an INDEX^n strategy is $\sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi n}}(1 + O(1/n))$.

3.1 The quantum bias

The quantum bias of any XOR game can be found efficiently by solving a semidefinite program (SDP) [CSUU08]. The optimization takes place over a matrix indexed by $s \in S$ and $t \in T$ with each entry corresponding to the expectation of the measurement outcome of a fixed game strategy. Such a matrix of inner products can be written as a positive semidefinite matrix and the expectation (or bias) of the game strategy is then an inner product of this matrix and one containing the information of the XOR game.

Specifically, the quantum bias of the INDEX^n game can be calculated as the optimal value of either SDP below

Primal problem (P)		Dual problem (D)	
supremum:	$\langle B, X\rangle$	infimum:	$\langle e, y\rangle$
subject to:	$\mathrm{diag}(X) = e$	subject to:	$\mathrm{Diag}(y) \succeq B$
	$X \succeq 0$		

where

- $\mathrm{diag}(X)$ is the vector on the diagonal of the square matrix X,
- e is the vector of all ones,
- $\mathrm{Diag}(y)$ is the diagonal matrix with the vector y on the diagonal,
- $B := \frac{1}{2}\begin{bmatrix} 0 & A \\ A^\top & 0 \end{bmatrix}$, where $A_{s,t} := \frac{(-1)^{s_t}}{n2^n}$.

For (P), consider the positive semidefinite matrix $X := YY^\top$, where

$$Y := \begin{bmatrix} \sqrt{n}\,2^n A \\ I_T \end{bmatrix}.$$

To show X is feasible in (P), one can check that each diagonal entry of X is equal to 1 from the definition of A above. Note that $\langle B, X\rangle := \sqrt{n}\,2^n\langle A, A\rangle = 1/\sqrt{n}$ proving that the quantum bias is at least $1/\sqrt{n}$ (since the quantum bias is the maximum of $\langle B, X\rangle$ over all feasible X).

For (D), let $y := \begin{bmatrix} u\,e_S \\ v\,e_T \end{bmatrix}$ where $u, v > 0$ (determined later) and e_S and e_T are the vectors of all ones indexed by entries in S and T, respectively. Then

$$\mathrm{Diag}(y) \succeq B \iff \begin{bmatrix} uI_S & -\frac{1}{2}A \\ -\frac{1}{2}A^\top & vI_T \end{bmatrix} \succeq 0 \iff uvI_T \succeq \frac{1}{4}A^\top A = \frac{1}{4n^2 2^n} I_T \iff uv \geq \frac{1}{4n^2 2^n}.$$

From above, if we set $v := \frac{1}{2n\sqrt{n}}$ and $u := \frac{1}{2\sqrt{n}\,2^n}$, then y is feasible in (D). Since

$$\langle e, y\rangle = 2^n u + nv = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}},$$

we know the quantum bias is at most $1/\sqrt{n}$ (since the quantum bias is equal to the minimum of $\langle e, y\rangle$ over all feasible y). Therefore, the quantum bias is exactly $1/\sqrt{n}$, as required.

The INDEX game turns out to be equivalent to the Retrieval game studied in [OW10] which is defined similarly except the first bit of Alice's input is always 0 and the other $n-1$ bits are chosen independently and uniformly at random. To see the equivalence, notice that in the INDEX game Alice can take her input $s \in \{0,1\}^n$, define $s' = \boldsymbol{m} \oplus s$, where m fixes the specific bit to a specific value, play the Retrieval game strategy with input s' to generate a', and then output $a := a' \oplus m$ (Bob plays the same strategy). Thus, any strategy for the Retrieval game with bias α yields a strategy for the INDEX game with bias α as well. We further remark that the quantum bias of the Retrieval game is shown to be $1/\sqrt{n}$ in [OW10] through the use of uncertainty relations. Using this result, and the equivalence to the INDEX game, we have another proof that the quantum bias of the INDEX game is $1/\sqrt{n}$.

3.2 The classical bias

We can assume without loss of generality that Alice and Bob's strategies are deterministic. Define $b \in \{0,1\}^n$ as the string of potential answers Bob gives where b_t is the bit that Bob outputs on input $t \in [n]$. Now let us examine Alice's strategy. For a fixed input s, if she outputs 1, they win the game with probability

$$\mathop{\mathbb{E}}_{t\sim\mu([n])} \Pr[b_t \neq s_t] = \frac{1}{n}|b \oplus s|_H,$$

where $|x|_H$ denotes the Hamming weight of a string $x \in \{0,1\}^n$. If she outputs 0, they win the game with probability

$$\mathop{\mathbb{E}}_{t\sim\mu([n])} \Pr[b_t = s_t] = 1 - \frac{1}{n}|b \oplus s|_H.$$

Since their strategies are deterministic, Alice should output the maximum of these two, so

$$\max\left\{\frac{1}{n}|b\oplus s|_H, 1-\frac{1}{n}|b\oplus s|_H\right\} = \frac{1}{2} + \left|\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{n}|b\oplus s|_H\right| = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2}\cdot\frac{2}{n}\left|\frac{n}{2} - |b\oplus s|_H\right|.$$

Therefore, the classical bias is *precisely* $\frac{2}{n}\,\mathbb{E}_{s\sim\mu(\{0,1\}^n)}\left|\frac{n}{2} - |b\oplus s|_H\right|$. Note that this quantity is independent of b, thus we could assume Bob always outputs 0 for every input. The quantity

$$\mathop{\mathbb{E}}_{s\sim\mu(\{0,1\}^n)}\left|\frac{n}{2} - |b\oplus s|_H\right|$$

corresponds to the mean deviation of the uniform binomial distribution. This is a well studied quantity [Fra45] and we know that

$$\mathop{\mathbb{E}}_{s\sim\mu(\{0,1\}^n)}\left[\left|\frac{n}{2} - |b\oplus s|_H\right|\right] = \sqrt{\frac{n}{2\pi}}\left(1 + O\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)\right).$$

Therefore, the classical bias is $\frac{2}{n}\sqrt{\frac{n}{2\pi}}\left(1+O\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)\right) = \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi n}}(1+O(\frac{1}{n}))$, as desired.

4 A construction of a quantum PO-RAC^n with optimal bias

In this section, we give an explicit construction of a quantum PO-RAC^n with optimal bias.

Lemma 2 (Optimal PO-RAC^n)**.** *For any integer $n \geq 2$, there exists a* PO-RAC^n *with bias $1/\sqrt{n}$ that uses $\lfloor n/2 \rfloor$ qubits.*

Our construction builds upon the previously mentioned RACs for sending 2 (resp. 3) classical bits with bias $1/\sqrt{2}$ (resp. $1/\sqrt{3}$). These are the vertices from the corners of a square inscribed in an equatorial plane in the Bloch sphere, and the corners of a cube inscribed in the Bloch sphere, respectively. To generalize this idea to an n-cube inscribed in an n-dimensional sphere, we use the intuition of *hyperbits*, which are a way to visualize such unit vectors in a quantum mechanical setting. A full discussion of hyperbits and their equivalence to certain quantum protocols is beyond the scope of this paper, but we refer the interested reader to the work of Pawlowski and Winter [PW12].

We note that, after the publication of this paper, we became aware that a similar RAC had been previously discovered by Wehner [Weh08], but remained unpublished.

4.1 The construction

Our construction is very similar to a proof of Tsirelson's Theorem [Tsi87]. We start by recursively defining the observables $G_{n,1}, \ldots, G_{n,n}$, for $n \geq 2$, which are used to define the actions of Alice and Bob in the PO-RAC^n. For $n = 2$ and $n = 3$, we define

$$G_{2,1} := X, \quad G_{2,2} := Y \qquad \text{and} \qquad G_{3,1} := X, \quad G_{3,2} := Y, \quad G_{3,3} := Z.$$

We use the $n = 3$ observables as a base case for a recursive formula:

$$\begin{aligned} n \text{ even}: &\quad G_{n,i} := G_{n-1,i} \otimes X, \ \text{ for } \ i \in \{1, \ldots, n-1\}, &\quad G_{n,n} = I \otimes Y, \\ n \text{ odd}: &\quad G_{n,i} := G_{n-2,i} \otimes X, \ \text{ for } \ i \in \{1, \ldots, n-2\}, &\quad G_{n,n-1} = I \otimes Y, \quad G_{n,n} = I \otimes Z. \end{aligned}$$

Note that these act on $\lfloor n/2 \rfloor$ qubits,[1] have eigenvalues ± 1, and satisfy the anti-commutation relation

$$\{G_{n,i}, G_{n,j}\} = 2\delta_{i,j} I.$$

Define the following operators for $x \in \{0,1\}^n$ and $t \in [n]$:

$$A_x := \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (-1)^{x_i} G_{n,i} \qquad \text{and} \qquad B_t := G_{n,t}^{\top}.$$

Note that $A_x^2 = I$, for all $x \in \{0,1\}^n$, and $B_t^2 = I$, for all $t \in [n]$, so each have ± 1 eigenvalues.

The PO-RAC^n protocol is defined below.

- Encoding states: Alice chooses a uniformly random $x \in \{0,1\}^n$, creates $\lfloor n/2 \rfloor$ EPR pairs, and measures the first "halves" with the observable A_x to get an outcome $a \in \{-1, +1\}$. The second "halves" now contain the post-measurement state $\tau_{x,a}$ and since $\mathrm{Tr}(A_x) = 0$, each a occurs with $1/2$ probability. She sends $\tau_{x,a}$ and a to Bob who now has the mixed state

  $$\rho_x := \frac{1}{2} \sum_a \tau_{x,a} \otimes |a\rangle\langle a|$$

  encoding the string x.

[1] We note here that the choice of these observables is not unique and there are applications in the literature that use slightly different observables. However, this particular choice reduces the RAC dimension by one qubit when n is odd. For example, for $n = 3$ our RAC uses $\lfloor n/2 \rfloor = 1$ qubit (as opposed to 2) just as in the well-known quantum RAC of three classical bits into one qubit.

- Decoding procedure: If Bob wishes to learn x_t, he measures his EPR halves with the observable B_t to get an outcome $b \in \{-1, +1\}$ and also measures to learn a. He computes $c = ab$ and outputs 0 if $c = +1$, and 1 otherwise.

In the next two lemmas, we show that the worst-case bias of this RAC is $\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}$ and that it is parity-oblivious, thereby proving Lemma 2.

Lemma 3. *The quantum* RAC $\{\rho_x : x \in \{0,1\}^n\}$ *has worst-case bias at least* $1/\sqrt{n}$.

Proof. We can assume at the beginning of the protocol, Alice and Bob share the maximally entangled state

$$|\psi\rangle := \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^{\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor}}} \sum_{j=1}^{2^{\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor}} |j\rangle_{\mathcal{A}} |j\rangle_{\mathcal{B}}.$$

The expectation value of the observable $C = A_x \otimes B_t$ in this state is given by:

$$\langle C \rangle = \langle \psi | A_x \otimes B_t | \psi \rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \frac{1}{2^{\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor}} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (-1)^{x_i} \underbrace{\sum_{j,k=1}^{2^{\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor}} \langle j|_{\mathcal{A}} \langle j|_{\mathcal{B}} \, G_{n,i} \otimes G_{n,t}^{\top} \, |k\rangle_{\mathcal{A}} |k\rangle_{\mathcal{B}}}_{= 2^{\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor} \delta_{i,t}} = \frac{(-1)^{x_t}}{\sqrt{n}}$$

where the third equality is derived from the anti-commutation relation. We can write

$$\langle C \rangle = \Pr[c = +1] - \Pr[c = -1] = \langle \psi | A_x \otimes B_t | \psi \rangle$$

implying

$$\Pr[\text{Bob outputs } 0] = \Pr[c = +1] = \frac{1}{2} \left[1 + \frac{(-1)^{x_t}}{\sqrt{n}} \right]$$

$$\Pr[\text{Bob outputs } 1] = \Pr[c = -1] = \frac{1}{2} \left[1 - \frac{(-1)^{x_t}}{\sqrt{n}} \right].$$

This proves that

$$\Pr[\text{Bob outputs } x_t] = \frac{1}{2} \left(1 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \right),$$

as desired. □

Lemma 4. *The quantum* RAC $\{\rho_x : x \in \{0,1\}^n\}$ *is parity-oblivious.*

Proof. Protocols involving shared entanglement and sending one classical bit have limited guessing probabilities for functions such as parity [PW12]. In particular, it can be shown that the biases α_S of learning x_S satisfy

$$\sum_{S \subseteq \{0,1\}^n \setminus \emptyset} \alpha_S^2 \leq 1.$$

In the RAC above, we have

$$\sum_{S : |S| = 1} \alpha_S^2 \geq n \cdot \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \right)^2 = 1$$

implying $\alpha_S = 0$ for all S of size 2 or greater, implying it is parity-oblivious. □

This concludes a construction of a quantum PO-RAC^n with optimal bias. However, we have not yet proved Theorem 1 since the encoding dimension is too high. We now discuss a small modification to simultaneously reduce the dimension of the RAC and to increase its device-independence.

4.2 Removing the classical message

Reducing the dimension of the PO-RAC^n $\{\rho_x : x \in \{0,1\}^n\}$ is straightforward. First notice that Bob simply takes his measurement outcome and changes it if $a = -1$ to obtain his guess for x_t. We can remove the need for this message if Alice simply changes the value of x for which Bob has the encoding. In other words, instead of sending a to Bob, she just switches every bit of x if $a = -1$. Then Bob's guess b is just as accurate in guessing x'_t where $x'_t = x_t$, if $a = +1$, and $x'_t = \overline{x_t}$, if $a = -1$. (Note that this is similar to what was done in Subsection 2.2). Therefore, Bob now has an encoding of x', which we denote by $\{\sigma_{x'} : x' \in \{0,1\}^n\}$. Notice that $\sigma_{x'}$ is a state on only $\lfloor n/2 \rfloor$ qubits which coincides with the optimal PO-RAC^n for $n = 2$ and $n = 3$ previously discussed.

It is easy to see that this new RAC has bias at least $1/\sqrt{n}$ by construction. We now argue that this quantum RAC is still parity-oblivious.

Lemma 5. *The quantum* RAC $\{\sigma_{x'} : x \in \{0,1\}^n\}$ *is parity-oblivious.*

Proof. We prove that any S-parity hidden from Bob in the quantum RAC $\{\rho_x : x \in \{0,1\}^n\}$ is still hidden from Bob in the quantum RAC $\{\sigma_{x'} : x' \in \{0,1\}\}$. Let $\tau_{x,a}$ be Bob's post-measured state immediately after Alice used measurement A_x and received output a. We can write

$$\rho_x := \frac{\tau_{x,0} \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|}{2} + \frac{\tau_{x,1} \otimes |1\rangle\langle 1|}{2} \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma_x := \frac{\tau_{x,0} + \tau_{\bar{x},1}}{2}.$$

Fix a subset $S \subseteq [n]$ of size at least 2. Since x_S is hidden from Bob in the RAC $\{\rho_x : x \in \{0,1\}^n\}$, we have $\sum_{x\,:\,x_S=0} \rho_x = \sum_{x\,:\,x_S=1} \rho_x$. Thus,

$$\left(\sum_{x\,:\,x_S=0} \tau_{x,0}\right) \otimes \frac{|0\rangle\langle 0|}{2} + \left(\sum_{x\,:\,x_S=0} \tau_{x,1}\right) \otimes \frac{|1\rangle\langle 1|}{2} = \left(\sum_{x\,:\,x_S=1} \tau_{x,0}\right) \otimes \frac{|0\rangle\langle 0|}{2} + \left(\sum_{x\,:\,x_S=1} \tau_{x,1}\right) \otimes \frac{|1\rangle\langle 1|}{2}$$

implying that

$$\sum_{x\,:\,x_S=0} \tau_{x,0} = \sum_{x\,:\,x_S=1} \tau_{x,0} \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{x\,:\,x_S=0} \tau_{x,1} = \sum_{x\,:\,x_S=1} \tau_{x,1}. \tag{1}$$

Now we can write

$$\sum_{x\,:\,x_S=0} \sigma_x = \sum_{x\,:\,x_S=0} \tau_{x,0} + \sum_{x\,:\,x_S=0} \tau_{\bar{x},1} = \sum_{x\,:\,x_S=1} \tau_{x,0} + \sum_{x\,:\,x_S=1} \tau_{\bar{x},1} = \sum_{x\,:\,x_S=1} \sigma_x$$

using Equation (1) implying that the quantum RAC $\{\sigma_x : x \in \{0,1\}^n\}$ also hides x_S from Bob. □

Since the quantum PO-RAC^n $\{\sigma_x : x \in \{0,1\}^n\}$ has optimal bias and uses only $\lfloor n/2 \rfloor$ qubits, this concludes the proof of our main result, Theorem 1.

4.3 Making our optimal PO-RAC^n device-independent

We first point out that our preparation of the PO-RAC^n $\{\rho_x : x \in \{0,1\}^n\}$ is not secure in the device-independent model for the following reason. Suppose the measurements are not trusted, in the sense that Bob controls them. Consider the case when Alice's measurement, which depends on x, simply outputs $a := x_1 \oplus x_2$. Then, when a is sent to Bob, he now knows some information about the parities of x.

Note that in the preparation of the RAC $\{\sigma_{x'} : x' \in \{0,1\}^n\}$ the even parities of x' are hidden from Bob by the no-signalling principle since they are equal to those for x and there is no communication from Alice

to Bob in the preparation of $\sigma_{x'}$ after Alice chooses x. This is the basis for our preparation of a quantum RAC secure in the device-independent security model.

There is one small caveat however that does not affect the security, but may change how x' is generated. That is, it may not be generated uniformly now. Consider the case when Bob controls the measurement and decides to set $a := x_1$. Then, $\sigma_{x'}$ will never be prepared if $x'_1 = 1$. However, there is an easy fix at the price of adding one classical bit of communication.

Before sending Bob's part of the (supposed) maximally entangled state, Alice can choose a random bit d and send that to Bob as well. (We assume Alice can flip a random coin without being effected from a malicious Bob.) Then Alice takes the XOR of d with her measurement outcome, and proceeds as usual. Bob can easily adjust his guess for x'_t using the value of d.

It is easy to see that this preparation of the PO-RAC^n $\{\sigma_{x'} : x' \in \{0,1\}^n\}$ hides the even parities, in the device-independent model, against any malicious Bob respecting the no-signalling principle, thus proving Theorem 6.

It is not the case that the preparation of the PO-RAC^n $\{\sigma_{x'} : x' \in \{0,1\}^n\}$ hides the odd parities as well in the device-independent model. For example, suppose Bob controls the measurement such that $a := x_1 \oplus x_2 \oplus x_3$. Then

$$x'_1 \oplus x'_2 \oplus x'_3 = (x_1 \oplus a \oplus d) \oplus (x_2 \oplus a \oplus d) \oplus (x_3 \oplus a \oplus d) = d$$

for any choice of x. Thus, if Bob controls the measurements, he can make it so that Alice's first three bits always have parity d, of which he knows the value!

We leave it as an open problem to see if there exists a preparation of an optimal PO-RAC^n that is still parity-oblivious in the device-independent model against either no-signalling or quantum adversaries.

Conclusion

We have provided the optimal bounds for parity-oblivious quantum RACs and showed that they are asymptotically better than the optimal classical ones. We discussed how these optimal RACs provide a large non-contextuality inequality violation and resolve the main open problem in a work of Spekkens, Buzacott, Keehn, Toner, and Pryde [SBK$^+$09]. We also studied optimal bounds for a related version of these RACs which only hide the even parities. We showed their equivalence to a non-local game and explained why even-parity-obliviousness was the correct notion of RAC in this setting. After constructing a family of optimal parity-oblivious RACs, we discussed how to make the even parities secure in the device-independent model.

We end with an open question. We have seen how even-parity-obliviousness plays a key role in our analysis, especially when making RACs secure in the device-independent setting. This raises the question: What can be said about the optimal bias for *odd*-parity-oblivious RACs? We have discussed how they can have greater bias than the two variants studied in this work, but perhaps the optimal bias can still be expressed as some nice function of the number of encoded bits. Also, it would be interesting to see if they can be made secure in the device-independent model as well.

Acknowledgements

This research was supported by the French National Research Agency, through CRYQ (ANR-09-JCJC-0067) and by the European Union through the ERC project QCC.

References

[ANTV99] A. Ambainis, A. Nayak, A. Ta-Shma, and U. Vazirani. Dense quantum coding and a lower bound for 1-way quantum automata. In *Proceedings of the 31st Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 376 – 383, 1999.

[ANTV02] A. Ambainis, A. Nayak, A. Ta-Shma, and U. Vazirani. Dense quantum coding and quantum finite automata. *Journal of the ACM*, 49(4):496–511, 2002.

[BARdW08] A. Ben-Aroya, O. Regev, and R. de Wolf. A hypercontractive inequality for matrix-valued functions with applications to quantum computing and LDCs. In *FOCS*, pages 477–486, 2008.

[BBBW83] C. Bennett, G. Brassard, S. Breidbard, and S. Wiesner. Quantum cryptography, or unforgeable subway tokens. In *Advances in Cryptology CRYPTO 1982*, pages 267–275, 1983.

[BCWdW01] H. Buhrman, R. Cleve, J. Watrous, and R. de Wolf. Quantum fingerprinting. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 87:167902, Sep 2001.

[BJK04] Z. Bar-Yossef, T. S. Jayram, and I. Kerenidis. Exponential separation of quantum and classical one-way communication complexity. In *Proceedings of 36th ACM STOC*, pages 128–137, 2004.

[BRSdW12] H. Buhrman, O. Regev, G. Scarpa, and R. de Wolf. Near-optimal and explicit Bell inequality violations. *Theory of Computing*, 8(27):623–645, 2012.

[CHSH69] J. Clauser, M. Horne, A. Shimony, and R. Holt. Proposed experiment to test local hidden-variable theories. *Physical Review Letters*, 23(15):880–884, 1969.

[CKS14] A. Chailloux, I. Kerenidis, and J. Sikora. Strong connections between quantum encodings, non-locality and quantum cryptography. *Physical Review A*, 89:022334, 2014.

[CSUU08] R. Cleve, W. Slofstra, F. Unger, and S. Upadhyay. Perfect parallel repetition theorem for quantum XOR proof systems. *Computational Complexity*, 17(2):282–299, 2008.

[DV10] A. De and T. Vidick. Near-optimal extractors against quantum storage. In *STOC*, pages 161–170, 2010.

[Fra45] J. S. Frame. Mean deviation of the binomial distribution. *The American Mathematical Monthly*, 52(7):377–379, 1945.

[GIKM98] Y. Gertner, Y. Ishai, E. Kushilevitz, and T. Malkin. Protecting data privacy in private information retrieval schemes. In *JCSS*, pages 151–160. ACM Press, 1998.

[GKK+08] D. Gavinsky, J. Kempe, I. Kerenidis, R. Raz, and R. de Wolf. Exponential separation for one-way quantum communication complexity, with applications to cryptography. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 38(5):1695–1708, 2008.

[HIN+06] M. Hayashi, K. Iwama, H. Nishimura, R. Raymond, and S. Yamashita. (4,1)-quantum random access coding does not exist—one qubit is not enough to recover one of four bits. *New Journal of Physics*, 8(8):129, 2006.

[Hol73] A. Holevo. Some estimates of the information transmitted by quantum communication channels. *Problemy Peredachi Informatsii*, 9:3–11, 1973.

[INRY07] K. Iwama, H. Nishimura, R. Raymond, and S. Yamashita. Unbounded-error one-way classical and quantum communication complexity. In *ICALP*, pages 110–121, 2007.

[KdW04] I. Kerenidis and R. de Wolf. Quantum symmetrically-private information retrieval. *Information Processing Letters*, 90(3):109–114, 2004.

[LPY+12] H.-W. Li, M. Pawłowski, Z.-Q. Yin, G.-C. Guo, and Z.-F. Han. Semi-device-independent randomness certification using $n \to 1$ quantum random access codes. *Phys. Rev. A*, 85:052308, May 2012.

[Nay99] A. Nayak. Optimal lower bounds for quantum automata and random access codes. *Proceedings of 40th IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, 0:369–376, 1999.

[OW10] J. Oppenheim and S. Wehner. The uncertainty principle determines the non-locality of quantum mechanics. *Science*, 330:6007:1072–1074, 2010.

[PW12] M. Pawłowski and A. Winter. From qubits to hyperbits. *Phys. Rev. A*, 85:022331, 2012.

[PZ10] M. Pawłowski and M. Żukowski. Entanglement-assisted random access codes. *Phys. Rev. A*, 81:042326, Apr 2010.

[Raz99] R. Raz. Exponential separation of quantum and classical communication complexity. In *Proc. 31st Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 358–367, New York, NY, USA, 1999. ACM.

[RK11] O. Regev and B. Klartag. Quantum one-way communication can be exponentially stronger than classical communication. In *STOC*, pages 31–40, 2011.

[SBK+09] R. W. Spekkens, D. H. Buzacott, A. J. Keehn, B. Toner, and G. J. Pryde. Preparation contextuality powers parity-oblivious multiplexing. *Physical Review Letters*, 102:010401, 2009.

[Tsi87] B. Tsirelson. Quantum analogues of the Bell inequalities: The case of two spatially separated domains. *Journal of Soviet Mathematics*, 36:557–570, 1987.

[VW11] T. Vidick and S. Wehner. Does ignorance of the whole imply ignorance of the parts? *Physical Review Letters*, 107:030402, 2011.

[Weh08] S. Wehner. Unpublished note, 2008.